REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 12-14 and 16 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11 and 15 have been canceled. All of the pending claims stand rejected. The previously indicated allowability of claims 1 and 4 has been withdrawn. A number of the pending claims have been amended to more specifically define the invention. The reintroduction of "isomers" in claims 1 and 5 is supported by the original language of those claims.

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §012(b) as anticipated by Iki et al. The examiner asserted that compounds RN 158833-86-4 and 158833-85-3 disclosed in the reference anticipate the claimed compounds when R2 is H and R1 is phenol or aniline. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments set forth above to claims 1 and 4.

Claims 1 and 4 also have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Gimenez et al. The examiner asserted that compound RN 114011-30-2 anticipates the claimed compounds when R2 is H and R1 is thiophene. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments above to claims 1 and 4.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as anticipated by the Upjohn Company. The examiner asserted that compound RN 88053-38-7 anticipates the claimed compounds when R2 is H and R1 is furan. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference does not anticipate the compounds encompassed by claim 1, as the scope of claim 1 does not include compounds in which R2 is H and R1 is furan. Claim 1 provides that if R2 is H, R1 is 2-, 3- or 4-bromophenyl optionally substituted with alkyl, halo, nitro or amine attached to any of the vacant positions on the ring; or isomers or salts thereof.

Claims 1, 5, 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§102(b) as anticipated by Fujikawa et al. The examiner asserted that compound RN 25350-75-4 disclosed in the reference anticipates the claimed compounds when R2 is H and R1 is bromophenol substituted by hydroxy. Applicants submit that this rejection has been obviated by the amendments above to the claims.

Claims 1, 4, 8-10, 12-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C.§02(b) as anticipated by Ponka et al. The examiner asserted that the reference discloses the compound of the claims in which R2 is H and R1 is pyridine and further teaches that this compound is useful in iron therapy. This rejection is traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims do not encompass a compound of formula 1 in which R2 is H and R1 is pyridine. As noted previously, compound claim 1 is directed to compounds in which when R2 is H, R1 is 2-, 3- or 4-bromophenyl optionally substituted with alkyl, halo, nitro or amine attached to any of the vacant positions on the ring; or isomers or salts thereof. Claim 5 is directed to a composition comprising a carrier or diluent and a compound of formula 1, wherein if R2 is H, R1 is thiophene, 2-, 3- or 4-bromophenyl optionally substituted with alkyl, halo, nitro or amine attached to any of the vacant positions on the ring; phenol or aniline; or isomers or salts thereof. In neither the compound nor the composition claims is R1 pyridine if R2 is H.

Furthermore, although Ponka et al. disclose picolinaldehyde isonicotinoyl hydrazone (PCIH), they do not disclose or suggest use of that compound as an iron chelating agent *in vivo*. They report the ability of a range of chelators to potentiate the activity of PIH in mobilizing Fe from reticulocytes. Results for the percentage of Fe released from 59Fe-reticulocytes by PCIH on its own are presented. The only data on iron released from reticulocytes by PCIH that they present is *in vitro* data.

Applicants further submit that Ponka et al. actually teach away from the use of PCIH *in vivo*. For although the authors

suggest at page 477, column 2, that there is a need for new iron chelating drugs, they suggest that PCIH is not "a moderately ... to very effective" iron chelating agent (see page 482). In fact, they state that only two chelators (N,N,-bis (2,3-dihydroxybenzoyl)-1,6-diaminohexane and tropolone) "deserve special comment." This comment indicates, therefore, the PCIH is not an effective iron chelating agent *in vitro*. There certainly is no teaching or suggestion that the compound would be effective as an iron chelating agent *in vivo*, much less that certain analogues of that compound would be effective in that role.

In view of the foregoing amendments and discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims of this application are in condition for allowance.

☒ Customer Number or Bar Code Label **6449**					
Name	Barbara G. Ernst, Reg. No. 30,377				
Signature	Barbara G. Ernst			*Date*	May 20, 2005
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	*State*	D.C.	*Zip Code*	20005
Country	U.S.A.	*Telephone*	202-783-6040	*Fax*	202-783-6031